

VZCZCXRO2314
PP RUEHROV
DE RUEHKH #0605 0671612
ZNY CCCCC ZZH
P 081612Z MAR 06
FM AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1805
INFO RUCNFUR/DARFUR COLLECTIVE PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L KHARTOUM 000605

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR AF/SPG AND IO/PSC

E.O. 12958: DECL: 03/08/2016
TAGS: [PREL](#) [KPKO](#) [NATO](#) [AU](#) [US](#) [SU](#)
SUBJECT: SUDAN'S RESPONSE: ENSURING THE AU REQUESTS A UN
RE-HAT OF AMIS

REF: STATE 36548

Classified By: CDA Eric Whitaker, Reason: Section 1.4 (b) and (d)

1. (C) Pol/Econ Chief delivered subject demarche on March 7 to MFA Department of the Americas Acting Director Abd Elghani Elnaim Elkarim. Rejecting the premise of the message, he offered several reasons why Sudan instead seeks to continue the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS):

-- AMIS is not a failure; large-scale combat in Darfur has given way over time to smaller incidents. AMIS is meeting its objectives, and is frequently commended for its work. Even so, it predictably needs more support;

-- The mandate of AMIS is open for discussion; mandate alone is not cause to switch from AMIS to the UN. The UN is in Sudan now, and so Sudan is not opposed to the UN per se;

-- Sudan's North-South conflict continued for more than 20 years, with no talk about imposing a UN mission. Why now, in Darfur?;

-- How would UN troops make peace? On the contrary, they would complicate matters, and perhaps bring terror to the area. Darfur is a large, open area, the size of France, and the presence of UN forces would make the situation more complicated;

-- The focus should be on achieving results through the Abuja peace process, as President Bashir recently conveyed in writing to President Bush. Talking of replacing AMIS with a UN mission strengthens the position of the rebels, who may decide to wait for the UN/NATO and not negotiate with the government any longer;

-- The U.S. appears to favor African troops and African leadership of a Darfur peacekeeping mission. Sudan concurs, and believes that the remaining issue, that of the mission's mandate, can be discussed;

-- Changing from AMIS to a UN mission involves more costs and logistics. The UN is more expensive. Funds could be used instead to support AMIS. UNMIS has not met its goal of 10,000 troops in Sudan, and has only reached a level of 5,000 so far. How is it certain that an adequate number could be obtained for Darfur?

-- Replacing AMIS with UN troops jeopardizes the position of the AU in the future regarding peace keeping and the handling of conflicts. It is important to strengthen and empower regional organizations. The AU should be given a chance to deal with its own issues. Its ability to do so helps worldwide; taking the mission away from the AU is treating it like a younger sibling who has things done for him by his or her older sibling rather than having to learn to do so by

himself or herself. The Peace and Security Council is so-named, as it is designed to deal with such issues; it needs self-confidence and support to carry out the tasks it was designed to handle.

12. (C) Abd Elghani also offered a copy of Minister of Foreign Affairs Lam Akol's statement of February 22 before the National Assembly on "The AMIS Transition to the United Nations." Post will fax a copy to AF/SPG.

WHITAKER